

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated August 4, 2004, the specification was objected to, claims 5-10, 19-24, and 31-36 were object to; claims 1-4, 11, 13, 16-18, 25, 27-30, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over WO 99/14737 (Lockwood); claims 12, 26, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Lockwood and U.S. Patent No. 6,453,289 (Ertem).

Specification :

1) The Examiner objected that the application does not contain any abstract of the disclosure. An abstract has been added herein that is copied from the front page of the PCT application from which the present application has entered U.S. national phase.

2) The Examiner objected that there were no section headings.

However, the section headings have been added by the Preliminary Amendment filed at the time of entering the US national phase of the PCT application.

3) The Examiner indicates that on page 6 at line 19, “steps 182 to 184” should be replaced by “steps 185 to 187”. The specification has been amended accordingly.

Claim Objections :

Claims 10, 24 and 36 were objected by the Examiner because they depend upon claims 1, 13, 27, whereas the limitation of “the first and second fractions” is not found in the claims 1, 13, 27.

Claims 10, 24 and 36 has been amended in order to depend upon claims 5, 19 and 36, as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 29 has been amended in order to depend upon independent claim 27, as suggested by the Examiner. In addition, an error has been corrected in claim 29 (replacement of “of” by “and the”).

Claim Rejections :

Independent Claims 1, 13 and 27 have been rejected as being “anticipated” by Lockwood et al ('737).

This document is already commented in page 1 of the patent application, as a prior art document.

The Examiner states that ba_i and bi_i of Lockwood et al. are two different versions of the speech signal and thus that the difference $ba_i - bi_i$ equates to the comparison of two different versions of the speech signal.

But ba_i is a long-term noise envelope estimator and bi_i is an internal noise estimator (col 3 lines 43-45 ; col 4 lines 5-7 of Lockwood et al. '380).

And a noise estimator, even if estimated partly from the speech signal, cannot be considered as a version of a speech signal. Therefore the difference $ba_i - bi_i$ cannot be assimilated to the comparison of two different versions of the speech signal, as set forth in Claims 1, 13 and 27.

Moreover, even if the Examiner's statement, that ba_i and bi_i could be two different versions of the speech signal was admitted (which is not believed to be a good assumption), neither ba_i , nor bi_i , is a denoised version of the speech signal. Indeed, both are noise estimates of this speech signal.

Therefore the independent Claims 1, 13 and 27 are not anticipated by Lockwood et al. because some essential features of these Claims are not described in this prior art document.

For the same reasons, claims 2 to 12, 16 to 26 and 28 to 38 which depend upon the above-mentioned independent Claims, are also believed to be allowable.

Consequently, it is requested that the 35 U.S.C § 103(a) rejection of these Claims be reconsidered.

In light of the foregoing, the prompt issuance of notice of allowance is respectfully solicited.

Appln. Serial No. 09/806,756
Amendment Dated November 2, 2004
Reply to Office Action Mailed August 4, 2004

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (MTR.0018US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

11-2-04



Dan C. Hu
Registration No. 40,025
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77024
Telephone: (713) 468-8880
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883